

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

THOMAS HAUSCHILD,

No. C 15-01556 WHA

Plaintiff,

v.

CITY OF RICHMOND AND  
CHRISTOPHER MAGNUS,

**ORDER RE DATES FOR  
SUMMARY JUDGMENT  
MOTIONS**

Defendants.


Plaintiff Thomas Hauschild has filed a motion for partial summary judgment and noticed a hearing for May 19, 2016. In response, defendants City of Richmond and Christopher Magnus filed an administrative motion to continue the hearing date for plaintiff's motion. The reason given is that defendants plan on filing cross motions for summary judgment on the same claims and it would be most efficient to conduct the hearing on the cross motions at the same time. Furthermore, as fact discovery does not close for several weeks, defendants aver that they have additional depositions scheduled which will provide evidence needed to oppose plaintiff's summary judgment motion and also to support their own summary judgment motion. Specifically, defendants assert they will be deposing plaintiff, and this deposition testimony is needed to rebut plaintiff's declaration submitted with his summary judgment motion.

Good cause shown, defendants' motion is **GRANTED** as follows. As stated in their filing, defendants shall file their summary judgment motion by **MAY 19**, noticed on the normal

1 35-day track, with a hearing set for **EIGHT A.M. ON JUNE 23, 2016**. Defendants' opposition to  
2 plaintiff's summary judgment shall be due on **JUNE 2**. Plaintiff's reply to defendants'  
3 opposition is due on **JUNE 9**. The hearing on plaintiff's summary judgment motion shall also be  
4 set for **JUNE 23 AT EIGHT A.M.**

5  
6 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

7  
8 Dated: April 21, 2016.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
WILLIAM ALSUP  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE